

REMARKS

Claims 1-33 are pending in this application, and have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Claims 1, 7, 14, and 21 are independent.

Initially, Applicants note that page 2 of the Office Action contains a typographical error, in that Species "III" is referred to instead of Species II.

Claims 1-5, 7-10, 12-15, 17-21, 23, 24, and 26-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,535,644 to Kurapati. Claims 6, 11, 16, 19, 22, 25, 32, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Kurapati.

Claim 1 is directed to a method of dividing a digital signal representing physical quantities, comprising the steps of determining an initial partitioning of the signal, displaying a representation of the signal and the previously determined signal partitioning at the same time, acquiring at least one partitioning modification parameter through an intervention by a user, and modifying the partitioning of the signal.

Among other important features of Claim 1 are displaying a representation of a signal and a previously determined signal partitioning at the same time, and acquiring at least one partitioning modification parameter through an intervention by a user.

Kurapati, as understood by Applicant, relates to the communication and presentation of wavelet encoded images. The Office Action states that Kurapati discloses "displaying a representation of signal (image) and the previously determined signal partitioning," and cites column 4, lines 1-11, and Fig. 3a, of that patent. However, Applicant submits that the cited portion of Kurapati does not describe a method in which

both the image and the partition are drawn on the display. In fact, the partition is not shown on the display, but merely on the drawings of the patent, in order to illustrate where a different processing occurs. Indeed, Kurapati clearly states at column 4, lines 8-11, that “[t]he dashed lines outlining the regions 310-341 are used to indicate that an image is not yet presented on the display area 300.” Therefore, it is submitted that a person having ordinary skill in the art could not say that both the image and the partitions are displayed at the same time.

The Office Action further states that Kurapati discloses, at column 4, line 12, to column 5, line 25, and Figs. 3b-3f, “acquiring at least one partitioning modification parameter,” wherein the parameter allegedly being acquired is “the finer resolution which is block’s H and L.” However, Applicant submits that this parameter is not “acquired” within the meaning of Claim 1, because it is completely predetermined. This is established by Figs. 3a-3f of Kurapati, in which the progressive modification of the partition is predetermined. Figs. 4a-4d illustrate timing diagrams of progressively finer resolution renderings, and the corresponding description of these figures at column 5, lines 26-60 also provide examples of predetermined evolutions of the partition; Applicant notes that the partition is directly linked to the resolution. Therefore, in Kurapati, the user cannot modify the partition during the process. On the other hand, by virtue of the features of Claim 1, the user can modify the partition and visually check that it fits his or her needs.

Nothing has been found in Kurapati that would teach or suggest displaying a representation of a signal and a previously determined signal partitioning at the same time, and acquiring at least one partitioning modification parameter through an intervention by a user, as recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Claim 1 is seen to be clearly allowable over Kurapati.

Independent Claim 14 is a device claim corresponding to method Claim 1, and is believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

Claim 7 is directed to a method of dividing a digital signal representing physical quantities, comprising the steps of determining at least one area of interest in the signal, determining an initial partitioning of the signal, including partitioning areas, and modifying the partitioning of the signal according to the at least one area of interest and a predetermined criterion.

The Office Action, at page 4, concedes that “Kurapati does not explicitly mention... avoiding the interest area between the partition area.” It appears to Applicant that the Examiner is thereby implicitly admitting that the concept of “area of interest” is not disclosed by Kurapati. Further, Applicant respectfully disagrees that the above feature, i.e., avoiding the interest area between the partition area, is “notoriously well known in the art.”

Indeed, in Kurapati, Applicant has found no mention of determining an area of interest in the image. By default, in Kurapati the central part of the image is encoded and decoded with more detail (see Fig. 3), and it is a so-called “focal region” (see column 3, lines 17 and 18). On the other hand, by virtue of the features of Claim 7, an area of interest can be determined by a user, and can be situated at any position in the image.

Nothing has been found in Kurapati that would teach or suggest determining at least one area of interest in a signal, determining an initial partitioning of the signal, including partitioning areas, and modifying the partitioning of the signal according to the at least one area of interest and a predetermined criterion, as recited in Claim 7.

Accordingly, Claim 7 is seen to be clearly allowable over Kurapati.

Independent Claim 21 is a device claim corresponding to method Claim 7, and is believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 7.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,


Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 286

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
#422813 v1